Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 24 Aug 94   Volume 94 : Issue 390

Today's Topics:
    100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination
      CompuServe Invasion has started (was Re: CW VIEWS) (2 msgs)
                           CW ...IS NOW!
                           FLAME the FCC
                         Scanner Freedom!
                 Telecommunicating (was Re: CW VIEWS)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 23 Aug 1994 22:55:17 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!
nntp.msstate.edu!olivea!ncd.com!newshost.ncd.com!sheridan.ncd.com!
stevew@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 100% NOTHING to do with CW...Repeaters and xfer of coordination
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33atdm$se6@agate.berkeley.edu>, kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken
A. Nishimura) writes:
|> Hi all -
|>
|>   Something to rest your code-wars weary eyes upon.....
|>
|> **
|>
|> Scenario:
|>

|> The following is hypothetical, but based on pseudo-reality.....
|>
|>   The following occurs in a "congested" area, where there
|> are more want-to-be repeater owners than there are available
|> frequency pairs. The coordinating body is trying to keep
|> some semblance of order, and has on file many legitimate
|> requests for a frequency assignment for new repeaters.
|>
|>   Repeater trustee/owner W1ABC decides that he wants out of the
|> repeater business. N1XYZ gets ownership of the physical repeater.
|>
|> Question:
|>
|> Should the coordinating body transfer the "coordination" to
|> N1XYZ with no questions asked, given the line of people waiting
|> for frequency assignments?

The coordination should come up for review, but normally, the coordination
would be approved assuming that all other aspects of the coordination
remain the same. At least this is the way it works in my area of the
country. You don't automatically get the sanction, yet you can expect
approval of a new sanction if you don't change anything except the call
on the repeater.

|>
|> **
|>
|> Some thoughts:
|>
|> * What this really is asking is whether the "coordination" is
|> part of the repeater that can be transferred with the repeater.
|>
|> * Does it make a difference under what circumstances the
|> transfer was made:
|>
|>stuff deleted concerning possible transfer scenarios...
|>
|>   -- The repeater owner sells it for an AMOUNT FAR EXCEEDING
|>   THE VALUE OF THE EQUIPMENT. Of course, implicit with this sale
|>   price is the transfer of the coordination. (i.e. the frequency
|>   pair is in effect being sold with the repeater.)
|>
|> * Is the last scenario illegal? Should frequency coordinating
|> bodies actively try to stop this type of activity?

Again. At least in my area, the sanction isn't automatically granted.
It is likely to get approved, but it isn't automatic. Anyone that
purchased a repeater under the above pretense is niave! The coordinating

bodies have to act as fairly as possible.

The reason that they'll usually issue the new sanction is that the
repeater IS an existing piece of hardware whose characteristics are
well known, i.e. we already know that this machine can live on the
given frequency with the given amount of power and provide the documented
service area without interfering with other machines(the ideal ;-)

|>
|> * If transfers of trusteeships are allowed, do aspiring repeater
|> owners who want to put up new boxes have to wait forever as
|> a pair will never "open" but be transferred ad infinitum?

Yep. Either that are put some hardware up on 1200! That's what a lot
of people are doing today.(Just like Ken say he's doing in his post ;-)

Steve KA6S

Date: 23 Aug 1994 14:06:56 GMT
From: george.inhouse.compuserve.com!news.inhouse.compuserve.com!compuserve.com!
news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CompuServe Invasion has started (was Re: CW VIEWS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Not new to the net, but it's been a few years' absence. I may be slow,
but I get there: I have figured out that I've jumped on a carousel that's
been going around for a while, and I'm getting off. I have the QRZ CD-ROM,
I didn't realize that such archives were part of its contents -- but I'm
curious, do you feel that it's in the interest of this communication medium
to treat irrelevant mudslinging as, umm, just another mode?

Date: 24 Aug 1994 00:04:59 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!koriel!
newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun
Subject: CompuServe Invasion has started (was Re: CW VIEWS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33cvq0jue1@mhadf.inhouse.compuserve.com> Peter Coffee WA2OJL/AE
<72631.113@CompuServe.COM> writes:
>Not new to the net, but it's been a few years' absence. I may be slow,
>but I get there: I have figured out that I've jumped on a carousel that's
>been going around for a while, and I'm getting off. I have the QRZ CD-ROM,

>I didn't realize that such archives were part of its contents -- but I'm
>curious, do you feel that it's in the interest of this communication medium
>to treat irrelevant mudslinging as, umm, just another mode?

Certainly, we'd like the radio newsgroups to be as polite and orderly
as possible. But, I'm not sure I've seen any real mudslinging in
the last few days :-)

Dana

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
     *
 * (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"   *

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 14:22:06 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@ames.arpa
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.3229.2427@channel1.com> alan.wilensky@channel1.com (Alan Wilensky)
writes:
>   BTW, did everyone out there read the post
>from the USCG man saying that CW training was dropped in '93?

Yes, but when I inquired about the 5870 KHz broadcasts in CW, he said
that is just an automated weather product. Then when I inquired as to
who it was being broadcast to and why, the link went dead.

Scratch one kosher meal, I guess. ;-)

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov
==
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
==

Date: 23 Aug 1994 18:37:35 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!wizard.uark.edu!comp!plaws@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FLAME the FCC
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>them professionally. They alone aren't responsible for who won the elections
>nor did they ever expect the interest in amateur radio licenses we see today.

Absolutely correct! That early '70s Honeywell was working just fine. If
the Republicans were still in, they would certainly never have wasted
money on new information systems. Progress? Who needs that?

For those who didn't see the post earlier in the summer, the main cause of
the delays (or so we're told :) is the installation of the new license-
processing system. Once it was installed, temps were hired to start in on
the backlog (allegedly 15,000 610s at the time). Too bad they didn't
understand FIFO - bunches of folks got tickets in < 7 weeks. The average
delay is closer to 14 weeks, with gusts to 17 (based on usenet posts).

If the "somebody" who posted that info originally (re: the new system)
could post it again maybe we could cut down these circular threads ...

(BTW, when Luck Hurder still worked at the ARRL, he would weigh in with
good info about stuff like this. They fired him. Too bad.)

Peter Laws<plaws@comp.uark.edu>|"Suppose you were a politician. Now suppose you
n5uwy@ka5bml.#nwar.ar.usa.noam |were an idiot. Ah, but I repeat myself."-Twain

----

Date: 23 Aug 1994 19:02:02 GMT
From: george.inhouse.compuserve.com!news.inhouse.compuserve.com!compuserve.com!
news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Scanner Freedom!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Scanners are routinely confiscated in Los Angeles? I live nearby,
and this is news to me. Not saying you're wrong, I'm just surprised.

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 00:21:29 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.duke.edu!solaris.cc.vt.edu!swiss.ans.net!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!
mjsilva@ames.arpa

Subject: Telecommunicating (was Re: CW VIEWS)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33cvnh$69s@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, Dana Myers (myers@Sun.COM) writes:
>In article 2E59FAC4@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:
>>In article <1994Aug23.012847.29853@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup
>>>The sooner amateur radio stops being so enamored with simplest forms of RF
>>>and starts thinking about telecommunications in general, the sooner we will
>>>all advance and the less spectrum we will loose.
>>
>>[I, and I know many others, take exception to that. What you and some others]
>>[here are obviously looking for is the Amateur Telecommunication Service, not]
>>[the Amateur *Radio* Service   ]
>
>
>C'mon Clay, you're setting up another strawman. What is the point of radio
>in the Amateur Radio Service? Communications, no?
>
>Maybe you can justify the distinction netween "radio" and "communications"
>for us all.

First of all, Dana, there's a world of difference between
"telecommunications" and "communications". "Communications" is a word
that can be stretched forever, including such things as whale grunts,
a glance that lasts a second longer than it needs to, and ant chemical
trails (we had an invasion last week, so it's on my mind).
Telecommunications, OTOH, has a much more restricted meaning, and I
would say that some of it's traits are transparency (I don't know or
care if my telephone connection is via cable, microwave, satellite,
etc) and utility (there's nothing exciting about sending a FAX; it had
just damn well better get there). Amateur radio will never do
telecommunications well, because we don't have the skills or the
budget or the desire to compete with the ATT's of this world. Even our
closest attempt, VHF/UHF packet, is really just a toy by
commercial standards (would you put up with it if you had to *pay* for
it?).

The fact that we don't do telecommunications well doesn't bother me,
because it was never our mission. In fact, the only communications
mentioned in 97.1 are public service, and especially emergency
service. The point of most of what we do is not communication in the
common sense (I want to communicate 'A' to 'X' and 'Y'). Most of the
time we don't care *who* we talk to (pardon, communicate with), or what
the subject is. This suggests to me that it's not the message that
matters, but the method, the *act* of communicating, and further it is
the act of communicating *over the radio*. Otherwise we could go down
to the corner bar, or check into a Compuserve chat area, or make random

phone calls, or put notes in bottles and toss them into the sea to have
random communications. When we do EME or ATV or CW/QRP the message
itself is usually of very little value, and the method is far from
transparent or utilitarian. We do these things because there *is*
something fascinating, even today, about radio communications. At the
same time, many of us are fulfilling the mandate in 97.1 for training
and advancing our skills, while a small, capable number of us (no,
not me personally!) are actually able to contribute to advancing the
radio art. OTOH, equating amateur radio with telecommunications
requires that the message be paramount, and anything that gets in the
way of passing the message is an impediment, a reduction of
efficiency. Doesn't sound like much of a hobby to me.

73,
Mike, KK6GM

Date: 23 Aug 1994 18:56:14 -0500
From: cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.141.2E54EEA5@ornl.gov>, <082094090723Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<1994Aug20.201526.19761@egreen.wednet.edu>
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

jmollan@egreen.iclnet.org (John Mollan - Harm) writes:

>Starting today, all discussion of cw will be held on 20 meters. I
>recommend a frequency of 14.015 Mhz. :-)

>73, John, AE7P

Sounds good to me! See you there!!

Red, GW0TJO

Date: Tue, 23 Aug 1994 20:41:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!
mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <33ak4h$r8t$1@mhadg.inhouse.compuserve.com>,
<1994Aug23.012847.29853@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <wyn.149.2E59FAC4@ornl.gov>
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

In <wyn.149.2E59FAC4@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:

>In article <1994Aug23.012847.29853@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>>   The name of the game is COMMUNICATION.
>>That the physical layer is via landline, RF or fiber optic is of no concern

>[So you would subjugate the main subject of amateur *radio* to a higher
> topic of "COMMUNICATION"]

Yes. We ARE a service, right? To continue to provide "service" we must
remain technically viable, right? We must COMPETE for spectrum access
with other COMMUNICATION services, right?

>>The sooner amateur radio stops being so enamored with simplest forms of RF
>>and starts thinking about telecommunications in general, the sooner we will
>>all advance and the less spectrum we will loose.

>[I, and I know many others, take exception to that. What you and some others]
>[here are obviously looking for is the Amateur Telecommunication Service, not]
>[the Amateur *Radio* Service   ]

In a world of increasingly limited spectrum and FCC auctions (more will come),
I fail to see how a bunch of radio hobbyists and historians and who refuse
to be technically competent will maintain their spectrum privileges.

>[Thanks for validating everything in my last post. It is becoming obvious]
>[some folks could alleviate their suffering here (no more whining), if they]
>[would sell their radio gear and buy a SLIP connection subscription to the]
>[INTERNET where they can do "advanced communications" until their heart is]
>[content. It is cheaper, greater bandwidth, and better sig-to-noise than   ]
>[anything amateur radio will be able to offer.

At least you finally admit that amateur radio has nothing to offer relative
to commercial services. At last someone else said it! No where did I
say we should ELIMINATE the RF aspect. I only said it is ONE aspect
of communication. What would be so terrible about a high-speed multi-
media amateur radio internet? Some of us actually ARE working on this
at a very local level.

```
>>We are NOT asking for a free ride, just that the ARRL testing proceedures
>                                                     ^^^^
>>reflect a little more of the later half of the 20th century.

>[Sorry, the ARRL has the word *radio* in its title.  Your aspirations and]
>[plans exceed its ability to deliver without changing its name and       ]
>[identity.                                                                ]

Yes, we DO have "RADIO" in out title.  The pony express had "pony" in
it's title.

--
  /`-_        kevin.jessup@mixcom.com  |
 {     }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc  |  Time for another tea party!
  \    /   Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA  |
   |__*|  N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio  |

------------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #390
*****************************
```